

The Day of Reckoning: The Value of the Integration Constant in the Vacuum Schwarzschild Solution

Abhas Mitra

Nuclear Research Laboratory

Bhabha Atomic Research Center, Mumbai- 400085, India

Email: amitra@apsara.barc.ernet.in

Abstract

The strongest theoretical support for Schwarzschild Black Holes (SBHs) is the existence of vacuum Schwarzschild/Hilbert solution. The integration constant α_0 in this solution is interpreted as the mass of the BH. But by equating the 4-volumes (an *invariant*) associated with the Schwarzschild metric and the Eddington-Finkelstein metric[1,2] for a SBH, we directly obtain here the stunning result that SBHs have the unique mass, $M_0 \equiv 0$! Thus the Event Horizon (EH) of a SBH ($R_g = 2M_0 = 0$, $G = c = 1$) gets merged with the central singularity at $R = 0$ and, after 90 years, the mysterious EH indeed gets erased from the non-singular $R > 0$ region of a completely empty ($R_0 = 0$) spherical spacetime in accordance with the intuition of the founders of General Relativity (GR)[3]. Consequently the entropy of SBHs have the unique value of zero, which instantly removes the quantum mechanical “information paradox” and the apparent conflict between GR and Quantum Mechanics, the two pillars of modern physics[4]. And it is time to wonder how this simple result was missed earlier and how the incorrect idea of (finite mass) SBHs took over General Relativity almost 65 years back and then went on misleading Astrophysics, Theoretical Particle Physics and even Quantum Information Theory! This clean result firmly establishes the fact, as far as isolated bodies are concerned, General Relativity is a singularity free theory even at the classical level! The Black Hole Candidates with mass $M > 0$ are thus not BHs and instead could be *hot* compact objects whose possibility has so far been overlooked in favour of *cold* Neutron Stars or BHs. This result is dedicated to the occurrence of 100 years of Relativity.

Within two years of formulation of General Relativity, Hilbert found the famous spherically symmetric vacuum solution of Einstein equations for a “Massenpunkt”, i.e., a “mass point” [3]:

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right)^{-1} dR^2 + R^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2); \quad R \geq R_0 = 0 \quad (1)$$

where θ and ϕ are the polar angles and the *integration constant* α_0 is interpreted as twice the gravitational mass of the “Massenpunkt”: $\alpha_0 = 2M_0$ ($G = c = 1$). Schwarzschild had found a similar looking solution where the radial variable were r instead of R : $R^3 =$

Schwarzschild and to avoid confusion we too would continue to refer this solution as the “Schwarzschild” solution (SS). Because of Birchoff’s theorem[2], this vacuum solution also represents the exterior static spacetime of a spherical body. If M_0 is the mass of this spherical body, its value should depend on the value of R_0 ; i.e, $M = M(R_0)$, $\alpha = \alpha(R_0)$ and, for $R_0 \leq 2M$, let us again write:

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right)^{-1} dR^2 + R^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2); \quad R \geq R_0 = \alpha_0 = 2M_0 \quad (2)$$

Also there could be a case when $R_0 > \alpha = 2M$, and let in this case

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{R}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{R}\right)^{-1} dR^2 + R^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2); \quad R \geq R_0 > \alpha = 2M \quad (3)$$

For such a case, the apparent singularity of the metric at $R = R_g = 2M$ would be of no concern because the vacuum metric would cease to be applicable in the region $R < R_0$.

The original identification of $\alpha = 2M$ is done by matching the vacuum solution in Metric (3) with the corresponding Newtonian solution at large R .

Newtonian gravitation allows for the existence of a spherical “point mass”, i.e, $R_0 = 0$, and since in Newtonian gravitation, mass is essentially of baryonic or leptonic origin (bare mass) with no negative “dressing” due to gravity or any self-energy, all masses including that of a “point” is necessarily finite, $M_0 > 0$. And, in GR too, it has so far been **assumed** that M_0 would continue to be finite even when the spacetime is completely empty, i.e, $R_0 = 0$ (mass point). It is this expectation which gave rise to the concept of Black Holes in the GR era. In the framework of this paradigm, there would be real physical vacuum spacetime not only for $R > 2M_0$ (metric 3) but also for $R \leq 2M_0$ (Metrics 1 and 2). And thus, in this paradigm, the singularity in metrics (1) and (2)

$$g_{00} = \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right); \quad g_{11} = \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right)^{-1} \quad (4)$$

at $R = \alpha_0 = 2M_0$ is considered to be a mere coordinate singularity. Two reasons are often cited for the foregoing assertion [1,2]:

(a) GR requires that, in any truly non-singular region, the determinant g of the metric coefficients must be negative *in any coordinate system* in order that its sign matches with the corresponding negative sign of g_M in a free falling Minkowskian spacetime:

$$g = J^2 g_M \quad (5)$$

where J is the Jacobian of the relevant coordinate transformation. Since, in spherical polar coordinates, $g_M = -R^4 \sin^2 \theta$, we obtain

$$g = -J^2 R^4 \sin^2 \theta \quad (6)$$

Thus, at an arbitrary θ , g can vanish only at $R = 0$ unless $J = 0$ at some finite R , a situation, highly unlikely, both, physically and mathematically. Nonetheless, our conclusion *will not be based on* the probable vanishing of g at some region of spacetime.

For the diagonal metrics (1) and (2), one has

Thus $J_1 = 1$ despite the “coordinate singularity” and at $R = \alpha_0$,

$$g_1^{EH} = -\alpha_0^4 \sin^2 \theta = -16M_0^4 \sin^2 \theta \quad (8)$$

appears to be negative under the assumption $\alpha_0 = 2M_0 > 0$.

(b) The Kretschmann scalar associated with metrics (1) and (2) is given by

$$K = \frac{12\alpha_0^2}{R^6} \quad (9)$$

and at the EH,

$$K^{EH} = \frac{12}{\alpha_0^4} = \frac{3}{4M_0^4} \quad (10)$$

too appears to be finite under the assumption $M_0 > 0$. Now let us consider the Schwarzschild metric for a BH (i.e., metric 1 and 2) in the isotropic coordinate ρ [1,2]:

$$R = \rho \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_0}{4\rho} \right)^2 ; \quad \rho = \frac{(R - \alpha_0/2) \pm \sqrt{R^2 - R\alpha_0}}{2} \quad (11)$$

in terms of which

$$ds^2 = - \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_0/4\rho}{1 + \alpha_0/4\rho} \right)^2 dt^2 + (1 + \alpha_0/4\rho)^4 d\rho^2 + R(\rho)^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \phi d\theta^2) \quad (12)$$

The corresponding metric determinant is

$$g_2 = -(1 + \alpha_0/4\rho)^2 (1 - \alpha_0/4\rho)^2 R^4 \sin^2 \theta \quad (13)$$

and which does vanish at $\alpha_0 = \rho/4$, i.e, at $R = \alpha_0$ (see Eq.[11]). This vanishing of g_2 at $R = \alpha_0 = 2M$ should immediately lead to an introspection about the true nature of the “coordinate singularity”. To this effect, recall the obvious fact that the variable R has only two extrema; one at $R = \infty$ and another at $R = 0$ and correspondingly we must have $dR = 0$ only at $R = \infty$ and $R = 0$. But from Eq.(11), it follows that

$$\frac{dR}{d\rho} = (1 - \alpha_0/4\rho)(1 + \alpha_0/4\rho) \quad (14)$$

and $dR = 0$ not only at $\rho = \infty$, i.e, at $R = \infty$ and at $\rho = -\alpha_0/4$, i.e, at $R = 0$, but also at $\rho = +\alpha_0/4$, i.e, at $R = \alpha_0$. Hence R has a *minimum* at $R = \alpha_0$ where $g_2 = 0$! Therefore, $R = \alpha_0$ and $R = 0$ must correspond to same spacetime where R has its only minimum. And this is possible only when $\alpha_0 = 0$.

Note that in case $R_0 > \alpha_0$, Eqs.(11-14) will cease to be valid for $R \leq \alpha_0$ and we would not obtain the result $g_2 = dR = 0$ at $R = \alpha_0$. These results are obtained *only when* we consider $R_0 \leq \alpha_0$. And for the BH, $R_0 = 0$.

Now consider the shape of the metric for $R = \alpha_0$, i.e, at $\rho = \alpha_0/4$ (Eq.[11]):

$$ds^2 \rightarrow +16d\rho^2 + \alpha_0^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \phi d\theta^2) \geq 0 \quad (15)$$

Thus, in no case, the metric is timelike at $R = \alpha_0$ which definitely means that $R = \alpha_0$ is not a mere coordinate singularity but on the other hand, a genuine spacetime singularity

region), would break down. To see the actual nature of ds^2 at $R = \alpha_0$, we recall the BH metric in the so-called double null coordinate[2]:

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right) dudv + R^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \quad (16)$$

where

$$u = t \mp R_*; \quad v = t \pm R_*; \quad R_* = R + \alpha_0 \log \left(\frac{R}{\alpha_0} - 1 \right) \quad (17)$$

The $\mp$ and $\pm$ signs in the above definition take care of both ingoing and outgoing geodesics. This shows that for a radial geodesic, as $R \rightarrow \alpha_0$, $ds^2 \rightarrow 0$ rather than $ds^2 > 0$. Then from Eq.(15) it transpires that as $R \rightarrow \alpha_0$, $d\rho \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_0 \rightarrow 0$, a result already obtained. Physically, occurrence of $ds^2 = 0$ would mean that for any infalling material particle, the 3-speed would be equal to the speed of light, the maximum permissible speed in relativity. Also note from Eq.(11) that **only** when $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\rho = R = \mathbf{real}$ over the entire manifold. In the passing, note that the dererminant g_3 associated with the metric (16)

$$g_3 = -\frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right)^2 R^4 \sin^2 \theta \quad (18)$$

too vanishes at $R = \alpha_0 = 2M_0$.

To ensure that all the readers are fully convinced about the resolution of this 90 year old mystery, we finally recall the Eddington-Finkelstein metric[1,2] which was designed exclusively for SCHs, i.e, for $R_0 = 0$, $M = M_0$, and $\alpha = \alpha_0$:

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right) dt_*^2 \mp \frac{2\alpha_0}{R} dt_* dR + \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_0}{R}\right) dR^2 + R^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \quad (19)$$

where the Finkelstein time coordinate

$$t_* = t \mp \alpha_0 \log \left(\frac{R}{\alpha_0} - 1 \right) \quad (20)$$

$$R_* = R; \quad \theta_* = \theta; \quad \phi_* = \phi \quad (21)$$

The corresponding metric coefficients are

$$g_{t_* R} = -(1 - \alpha_0/R), \quad g_{RR} = (1 + \alpha_0/R), \quad g_{t_* R} = g_{R t_*} = \alpha_0/R \quad (22)$$

In this case the determinant is same as g_1 :

$$g_4 = -g_{\theta\theta}g_{\phi\phi}(g_{t_* R}^2 - g_{t_* t_*}g_{RR}) = -R^4 \sin^2 \theta = g_1 = g_M \quad (23)$$

Again, everywhere, $J_4 = 1$. Now let us apply the principle of *invariance of 4-volume* for the coordinate systems (t, R, θ, ϕ) and (t_*, R, θ, ϕ) at arbitrary R and **not necessarily at $R \leq 2M$** :

$$\sqrt{-g_4} dt_* dR d\theta d\phi = \sqrt{-g_1} dt dR d\theta d\phi \quad (24)$$

Since $g_4 = g_1$, we promptly obtain

$$dt_* = dt \quad (25)$$

$$dt \mp \frac{\alpha_0}{R - \alpha_0} dR = dt \quad (26)$$

which leads to

$$\frac{\alpha_0}{R - \alpha_0} = 0; \quad \text{at any } R \quad (27)$$

Thus, *in a most direct manner*, we obtain the stunning result that the mass of the Schwarzschild BHs:

$$M_0 = M(R_0 = 0) = \alpha_0/2 \equiv 0 \quad (28)$$

Prosaically, this means that, the gravitational mass of a “mass point” ($R_0 = 0$) is **actually** $M_0 \equiv 0$ which, however, following the Newtonian hangover has so far been assumed to be finite!

Then the EH merges with the central singularity at $R = 0$ and hence the metric (1) has only one singularity, the singularity at $R = \alpha = \alpha_0 = 0$. Note that even when $\alpha = 2M = 0$, $K^{EH} = K(R = 0) = \infty$ implying that this is a curvature singularity. It may be also recalled that in GR, unlike in Newtonian gravitation, occurrence of $M = 0$ does not necessarily mean absence of matter. A zero total energy occurs whenever all sources of positive energy like baryonic or leptonic mass energy and internal energy get exactly balanced by negative self-gravitational or any other self energy. Now let us briefly recapitulate the series of wrong notions which led to the greatlt incorrect idea of finite mass SBHs:

1. The integration constant α_0 appearing in the Hilbert (now known as Schwarzschild) solution was erroneously considered to be positive definite ($\alpha_0 > 0$) when attempt should have been made to fix it with suitable physical condition(s), as is the norm for fixing integration constants.

2. Even assuming that $\alpha_0 > 0$, one could have attempted to find out the 3-speed (v) of a test particle at $R = \alpha_0$ and $R < \alpha_0$ and by realizing that once $v \rightarrow 1$ in any coordinate system, rule of relativistic addition of velocities must ensure that $v \rightarrow 1$ in all other coordinate system.

3. The fact that the acceleration and more importantly, physically measureable *Acceleration SCALAR*, a , blows up at $R = \alpha_0$ [3, 5] was always ignored. Attention was focussed only on the geometrical scalars such as Kretschmann scalar without realizing that at a mere coordinate singularity none of the Physical Scalars would vanish. On the other hand, the value of α_0 , an integration constant, should have been fixed by taking help of physical quantities, such as a .

4. Chandrasekhar’s discovery of an upper mass limit for White Dwarfs only gave the upper mass limit of **cold** static objects and all it meant is that collapse can proceed beyond the cold White Dwarf stage. But this was interpreted as existence of SBHs as the immediate next step.

5. Similarly in context of the existence of the Oppenheimer-Volkoff limit[6], which at present, is considered to be $\sim 3 - 4M_\odot$, it was ignored that this limit corresponds to **cold** and strictly static baryonic objects. The possibility of likely existence of Einstein collapse solutions for **hot** (i.e, objects primarily supported by trapped radiation pressure) and quasistatic objects (which would generate pressure gradient even without any nuclear fuel) was never considered.

6. We recall that there is only one *exact analytical* solution of spherical gravitational

collapses to a SBH in a proper time[7]

$$\tau_c = \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\frac{R_i^3}{2GM} \right)^{1/2} \quad (29)$$

Since the dust ball is at rest at $t = 0$, we can use the equation for hyrdo-static balance[6] at $t = 0$:

$$\frac{dp}{dR} = -\frac{p + \rho_i}{R(R - 2M)}(4\pi R^3 p + M) \quad (30)$$

Since for a dust $p \equiv 0$, we have $dp/dR \equiv 0$, and then the foregoing Eq. yields $\rho_i = 0$. From thermodynamical point of view too, whether at rest or not, a $p = 0$ equation of state is physically obtained only if $\rho = 0$. Therefore, trivially, the mass of the dust ball is zero for a finite R_i . Hence the mass of the resultant SBH is indeed $M = 0$. But this was always ignored, it was pretended that eventhough, $p = 0$, we must have $\rho = \text{finite}$ and M too would be finite in tune with the idea that the integration constant $\alpha_0 > 0$ (when it was actually zero).

And when $M = 0$, from Eq.(29), it follows that, $\tau_c = \infty$. Thus though the $M = 0$ SBHs are, mathematically, allowed by GR, they cannot be realized in an universe with finite proper age.

Since there is no EH in a finite proper time, there is no trapping or loss of quantum information either and hence there is no question of any conflict between GR and quantum mechanics[4].

In some different papers, it was shown that even for the most general case of spherical collapse (i.e, not necessarily for uniform dust), no trapped surface is ever formed[8,9,10]. Thus a collapsing fluid must always radiate and if it would be assumed to undergo continued collapse $M \rightarrow 0$ asymptotically. This is the reason that the integration constant $\alpha_0 = 2M_0$ turned out be identically zero. Hence the observed BH candidates with masses often much higher than the upper mass limit of *cold baryonic* bodies in hydrostatic equilibrium, cannot be SCBs. Detailed analysis of recent observational data indeed suggests that the BH candidates have strong intrinsic magnetic moments rather than any EH[11,12,13,14]. And it has been suggested that the BH candidates are Magnetized Eternally Collapsing Objects (MECOs). These are extremely *hot* objects in quasistatic equilibrium due to extremely strong radiation and magnetic pressure[10,11,12,13]. However, if Quantum Gravity would be invoked, the supposed Black Holes could be *cold* and *static* configurations with hard surfaces[14].

Much investigations would be required to be certain about the precise nature of the observed BH candidates. In any case, since the BH paradigm was built on the *assumption* $\alpha_0 > 0$, and now that it is found that, actually, $\alpha_0 = 0$, this paradigm collapses immediately irrespective of the fact that, at this moment, most of the authors would close their eyes to ignore this stunning result. With $\alpha_0 = 0$, the Schwarzschild, Hilbert and related solutions become identical and the physical confusion arising from mathematical gauge freedom vanishes for the vacuum case.

References

- [1] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields* (Pergamon Press,

- [2] C. Misner, K.S. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W.H. Freeman and Co., San Fransisco, 1973).
- [3] S. Antoci and D.E. Liebscher, *Astron Nachr.* **322**, 137 (2001), (gr-qc/01102084).
Also , see, gr-qc/0406090
- [4] G. 't. Hooft (1995) (gr-qc/950950).
- [5] A. Mitra, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **15(5)**, 439, 2002 (astro-ph/0207056)
- [6] J.R. Oppenheimer and G.M. Volkoff, *Phys. Rev.* **55**, 374 (1939).
- [7] J.R. Oppenheimer and H. Snyder, *Phys. Rev.* **56**, 455 (1939).
- [8] A. Mitra, astro-ph/0408323 (2004)
- [9] A. Mitra, *Found. Phys. Lett.*, **13(6)**, 543 (2000) (astro-ph/9910408)
- [10] D. Leiter and S. Robertson, *Found. Phys.Lett.*, **16**, 143 (2003) (astro-ph/0111421).
- [11] S. Robertson and D. Leiter, *Astrophys. J.* **565**, 447 (2002), (astro-ph/0102381).
- [12] S. Robertson and D. Leiter, *Astrophys. J.* **569**, L203 (2002), (astro-ph/0310078).
- [13] S. Robertson and D. Leiter, *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **350**, 1391, (2004)
(astro-ph/0402445).
- [14] A. Mitra in *Black Holes: Research and Development*, ed. Frank Columbus (Nova Science Publishers, NY, in press).